Dear Jim,

4/18/75

You decide for yourelf when you read Kaiser's letter of the 14th whether or not he has been helpful.

I think he has been. Maybe if he reacts to what I've written he'll find it possible to be more helpful.

The other uncredited use of my work in that issue is by Groden, who presents it as his.

I find it interesting that Kaiser now claims to have found this transcript by accident in the Archives yet knowing our book had been printed and knowing I had offered it and the ancillary rights to Rolling Stone he makes no mention of this claimed independent "discovery" of his in the piece. Nor does he indicate any awareness of the files the Archives has to have on this. Or what we wrote about it in the book.

He is mad at Rolling Stone. He thinks they gypped him.

He told Jerry they were not going to use his piece at all but decided to because they had all the money he spent tied up in it. Or maybe Newhall told me that.

Anyway, the major part of the article and all that has any value is our work.

He was here November 13, 1974. He got an copy then, before pub date. He then made no reference I recall to having found it in the Archives. But he could xxx have been told about it by Rolling Stone. The odds are so enormously against his spending only two days there and finding and making notes on this transcript when the files total about 300 cubic feet. And why did he not just get a xerox? Why waste all the costly time away from home when he could xerox so cheaply and have so much better use of his time? Or be able to reproduce some of the chpicer morsels in facsimile.

Note also that he has missed the other and sensational content of the book. like the Commission's possession of the autopsy pictures whereas there has been the constant pretense the Kennedy family withheld all that.

He is an experienced reporter. That is legitimate news. He was having trouble persuading Rolling Stone not to junk his piece. And he didn't use that? This can only mean that he did not really study the transcript in the Archives or did not understand it. If he didn t understand that, how come he picked up everything I emphasized, like on the back cover? Selective sharpness of perception and understanding?

I've got a marked copy. The box on Ford is not the only ripoff. Nobody in the world will believe he saw only what I did in that hearing and used only the exact words entirely independently. There is more I did not quite. He also did not.

Now he wrote me after he was here. I did ask him to ask Rolling Stone again about the ancillary rights. You have that letter of 1/4/75. He did not say that they would not or should not buy any rights from me when he had discovered this on his own and own commission from them nor did he when I wrote 1/4/75. He also makes no reference to this history in this letter.

I really was on my way to filing his letter without response when Bill asked me if I'd read the p.s. That did make me mad. I then did decide to let what I d have preferred not to let go in what is not just an outburst of anger. I'm hopifig that he'll be provoked into spilling more. I think what he says about the editors is helpful and if I can get him angry enough or self-defensive enough he may yet give us the case that exists in fact if not in law. Or not enough in law to justify filing.

Now the Washington representative of Rolling Stone has asked the Maryland kids if I'll appear on their radio show. Through them I've accepted. I've asked them to be present, as excitied kids can be expected to desire, and to tape. I expect the invitation to be withdrawn. Three days of silence. We'll see. Best, HW